

## Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

8 August 2017

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Mo Khursheed, Peter Money, John Morse and Brian Stead</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer) and Alan Tilly (Transport and Aviation Manager).</p>
60.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
61.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Morse declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 8 as it is in his ward, but would remain in the room for the discussion of the item.</p> <p>Councillor Mohammed Khursheed declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5 as it is in his ward, but would remain in the room for the discussion of the item. Councillor Khursheed also declared a non-pecuniary interest in Items 7 and 8, having spoken to the applicants regarding the items, and would leave the room during the discussion of the items.</p>
62.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
63.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in public.</p>
64.	<p><b>10 PRINCES PARK LANE - 72808/APP/2017/2020</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p><b>Single-storey rear extension, involving the demolition of the existing rear extension.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which sought the demolition of the existing single-</p>

storey rear extension, and proposed a new single-storey extension that extended 6m from the original rear wall of the property, and the garage would be removed as part of the development.

It was noted that a petition in support of the application had been received, although the lead petitioner was not present, and this petition was supported by both adjacent neighbours at numbers 8 and 12 Princes Park Lane.

Members were informed that the extension exceeded current policy, but due to the exceptional circumstances regarding the case, neighbour support and extensions on both adjoining properties, the impact from the proposal was deemed acceptable.

The Committee confirmed that there was evidence of special circumstances regarding the application, and were happy to support the proposal. As such, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved.**

65. **LAND FORMING PART OF 12 DAGNALL CRESCENT - 72273/APP/2017/1211**  
(Agenda Item 6)

**Two-storey, two-bed attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space and creation of a new vehicular crossover to front.**

Officers introduced the application, which sought the erection of a two-storey, two-bed attached dwelling, and highlighted the addendum, which included an amendment to reason 1 for refusal.

Councillor Burles addressed the Committee on behalf of a petition in objection to the application. Members heard that car parking issues in both Dagnall Crescent and Benbow Way would be exacerbated by the proposal, and this would impact further upon the access for large vehicles and emergency services. The Committee were informed that the application would also have an unacceptable impact on the street scene and a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties, which was accentuated by the angle between houses, while the amenity space proposed would not be adequate for a house of that size.

Members agreed that the application was just over the distance from neighbouring properties to ensure it was policy compliant, but agreed with the reasons for refusal laid out in the officer's report.

The officer's recommendation was then moved and seconded, and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application was refused.**

66. **7 NESTLES AVENUE - 49059/APP/2017/1086** (Agenda Item 7)

**Variation of condition 5 (no other use including within Class D1) of planning permission ref: 49059/APP/2011/2790 dated 29-05-2012 (use as higher education college) to allow for use of building for primary education.**

Councillor Khursheed left the room during the discussion of this item.

Officers introduced the application, which sought a variation of planning approval

condition 5 for the conversion of the building to allow for one unit to be used as a primary school.

Members agreed that the application would pose an unacceptable risk to highway and pedestrian safety, and was not an acceptable site for a primary school.

Councillors moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

67. **14 COLBROOK CLOSE - 35144/APP/2017/94** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end and first floor side/rear extension (Part Retrospective).**

Councillor Khursheed had left the room for the discussion of this item.

The application sought a first floor side/rear extension which incorporated the conversion of the roof from hip to gable, and a rear dormer window. The proposal was submitted to address concerns raised in the extant enforcement notice, and was largely retrospective, although included an amendment of the extension.

Officers highlighted the addendum, which included an amendment to reason 4 for refusal.

The Head of Planning and Enforcement commented that there was a typographical error within the officer's report, and confirmed that the report should read as follows: "Its width at 4m would be more than two thirds that of the original dwelling (5.8m)".

The Chairman noted that the applicant had requested a deferral of the item, but noted that a full report had been received by the Committee for consideration.

Members commented that the development breached planning policy, and the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.

**RESOLVED: That the application was refused.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.34 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Luke Taylor on [ltaylor3@hillington.gov.uk](mailto:ltaylor3@hillington.gov.uk). Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

**The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.**